



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/901,577	07/11/2001	Tsuyoshi Saito	KOKUSAI069	4806
21254	7590	01/13/2005	EXAMINER	
MCGINN & GIBB, PLLC 8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD SUITE 200 VIENNA, VA 22182-3817			UNGAR, DANIEL M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2132	

DATE MAILED: 01/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application N .

09/901,577

Applicant(s)

SAITO ET AL.

Examiner

Daniel M. Ungar

Art Unit

2132

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 July 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 July 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>07/11/02, 12/20/02</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**DETAILED OFFICE ACTION**

1. Claims 1-12 have been examined.

**PRIORITY**

2. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The certified copy has been filed in parent Application No. 2000-211849, filed on 07/12/2000.

**SPECIFICATION**

3. The abstract is objected to for the following informality: the word "Abstract" in "Abstract of the Disclosure" is misspelled. Appropriate correction is required.

**CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. 112**

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:  

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
5. Claim 3 is rejected as being indefinite. It is unclear if applicant wishes to claim the very semiconductor manufacturing apparatus described in claim 1, in which case it is unclear how the claim further limits claim 1, which already includes "[a] semiconductor manufacturing apparatus [...] according to claim 1"; or if applicant is claiming any and all semiconductor manufacturing apparatuses, and the claim simply illustrates its intended use by adding, "[...] connected to [...]".  
The claim rewritten in independent form may clarify the scope of the claim.
6. Claim 4 is rejected as being indefinite. It is unclear if

applicant wishes to claim the very remote operation device described in claim 1, in which case it is unclear how the claim further limits claim 1, which already includes "[a] remote operation device [...] according to claim 1"; or if applicant is claiming any and all remote operation devices, and the claim simply illustrates its intended use by adding, "[...] for use with [...]".

The claim rewritten in independent form may clarify the scope of the claim.

***CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. 103(a)***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Ogushi et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,385,497, in view of Tonozuka et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,650,940.

8. Regarding claims 1, 3, and 4, Ogushi et al. disclose a remote control system for one or more semiconductor manufacturing apparatuses capable of accessing a supervisory device (see column 2, line 59 - column 3, line 3; claim 15) from a remote operation device through a communication line (see column 3, lines 10-30), that enables the same operations by the remote device as those carried out by the supervisory device to be performed on the semiconductor manufacturing apparatus(es) (see column 1, lines 35-43; column 4, lines 48-59).

9. Although Ogushi et al. disclose data exchange between the supervisory device and the remote device (see column 3, lines 46-54; column 4, lines 14-21), they do not explicitly disclose that the remote operation device displays the same screen as that displayed in the supervisory device. Nevertheless, Tonozuka et al., in a similar field of endeavor, disclose the operation of a supervisory device from a remote device in which the same information is displayed on both the supervisory device and the remote device (see column 2, lines 26-37; column 4, lines 10-33).

Art Unit: 2132

To one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, it would have been an obvious modification to the system of Ogushi et al. to present the communicated data that is common to the supervisory device and the remote device as the same screen, as is taught by Tonozuka et al., for more precisely monitoring the notification and information outputted by the supervisory device.

10. Regarding claim 2, Ogushi et al. discloses the supervisory device performing user authentication on the remote operation device (see column 6, lines 27-32; claims 12 and 13).

11. Regarding claim 5, Ogushi et al. disclose a remote control system for one or more semiconductor manufacturing apparatuses comprising

- a local area network system including a host device and one or more semiconductor manufacturing apparatuses (see column 3, lines 10-14; figure 1);
- a remote operation device with a communication element accessible to the host device on the semiconductor manufacturing side by way of a communication line (see column 3, lines 15-30);
- on the host device an IP routing function and protocols for remote control operation, and a communication element receiving a call incoming from the communication line (see column 1, lines 44-57; column 3, lines 31-45; column 4, lines 48-59);
- the host device performing user authentication (see column 6, lines 27-32; claims 12 and 13);
- the remote device remotely controlling and operating the host device (see column 1, lines 35-43; column 4, lines 48-59).

12. Although Ogushi et al. disclose data exchange between the supervisory device and the remote device (see column 3, lines 46-54; column 4, lines 14-21), they do not explicitly disclose that the remote operation device displays the same screen as that displayed in the supervisory device. Nevertheless, Tonozuka et al., in a similar field of endeavor, disclose the operation of a supervisory device from a remote device in which the same information is displayed on both the supervisory device and the remote device (see column 2, lines 26-37; column 4, lines 10-33).

Art Unit: 2132

To one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, it would have been an obvious modification to the system of Ogushi et al. to present the communicated data that is common to the supervisory device and the remote device as the same screen, as is taught by Tonozuka et al., for more precisely monitoring the notification and information outputted by the supervisory device.

13. Regarding claim 6, Ogushi et al. fail to disclose a modem as a communication element. Tonozuka et al., in a similar field of endeavor, do disclose a modem as a communication element (see column 4, lines 34-43). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included a modem in both the host device and the remote device to connect the two.

14. Regarding claim 7, Ogushi et al. disclose that the host device and the remote operation device are connected in communication means through a network (see column 1, lines 58-66). Thus it is inherent that each includes a terminal adapter as a communication element.

15. Claims 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogushi et al. in view of Tonozuka et al., as established above, in further view of Crater et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,805,442.

Ogushi et al. disclose a remote control system for one or more semiconductor manufacturing apparatuses comprising

- a local area network system including a plurality of host devices and one or more

- semiconductor manufacturing apparatuses (see column 3, lines 10-14; figure 1);

- a remote operation device with a communication element accessible to the host devices on the semiconductor manufacturing side by way of a communication line (see column 3, lines 15-30);

- on the host device an IP routing function and protocols for remote control operation, and a communication element receiving a call incoming from the communication line (see column 1, lines 44-57; column 3, lines 31-45; column 4, lines 48-59);

Art Unit: 2132

the host devices performing user authentication (see column 6, lines 27-32; claims 12 and 13);

the remote device remotely controlling and operating the host devices (see column 1, lines 35-43; column 4, lines 48-59).

16. Although Ogushi et al. disclose a plurality of host devices connected with one or more semiconductor manufacturing apparatuses, they do not explicitly disclose a router as a communication element. Likewise, they do not explicitly disclose a router as the communication element of the remote operation device to connect it to the host devices. Nevertheless, Crater et al., in a similar field of endeavor, disclose routing to communicate between the hosts and their clients, and between the hosts and the remote device (see column 1, line 53 – column 2, line 9; column 4, lines 18-29). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have utilized a router to facilitate IP communication in the local area network and to the remote device.

17. Although Ogushi et al. disclose data exchange between the supervisory device and the remote device (see column 3, lines 46-54; column 4, lines 14-21), they do not explicitly disclose that the remote operation device displays the same screen as that displayed in the supervisory device. Nevertheless, Tonozyuka et al., in a similar field of endeavor, disclose the operation of a supervisory device from a remote device in which the same information is displayed on both the supervisory device and the remote device (see column 2, lines 26-37; column 4, lines 10-33). To one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, it would have been an obvious modification to the system of Ogushi et al. to present the communicated data that is common to the supervisory device and the remote device as the same screen, as is taught by Tonozyuka et al., for more precisely monitoring the notification and information outputted by the supervisory device.

18. Regarding claim 9, Ogushi et al. disclose the host devices and the remote devices connecting via the internet (see column 1, lines 43 and 51 and 63).

19. Regarding claim 10, Ogushi et al. disclose communication line between the host devices and the remote device to be the internet (see column 1, lines 43 and 51 and 63), which meets the limitation of a wide area network. However, they fail to explicitly disclose the communication line between the host devices and the remote device to be a local area network. Nevertheless, Crater et al., in a similar field of endeavor, disclose the communication line to be a local area network or a wide area network (see column 3, lines 27-33; column 6, lines 7-20). Given these teachings it would have been obvious to use the system of Ogushi et al. with a communication line that is either a local area network or a wide area network to perform the remote operations either internal or external to the organization.

20. Regarding claim 11, Ogushi et al. disclose a remote control system for one or more semiconductor manufacturing apparatuses comprising

- a local area network system including a plurality of host devices and one or more semiconductor manufacturing apparatuses (see column 3, lines 10-14; column 7, lines 11-34; figure 1);
- an access server as its communication element connected with the host devices (see claims 20 and 21);
- a plurality of remote operation devices with a plurality of communication elements accessible to the host devices on the semiconductor manufacturing side by way of a communication network (see column 7, lines 11-34; column 3, lines 15-30);
- on the host devices an IP routing function and protocols for remote control operation (see column 1, lines 44-57; column 3, lines 31-45; column 4, lines 48-59);
- the host devices performing user authentication (see column 6, lines 27-32; claims 12 and 13);
- the remote device remotely controlling and operating the host devices (see column 1, lines 35-43; column 4, lines 48-59).

21. Ogushi et al. do not explicitly disclose the use of a plurality of communication networks to connect between the host devices and the remote devices. However, Crater et al. present a plurality of communication networks by which to connect the devices, and their respective



Art Unit: 2132

communication elements (see column 6, lines 50-58; column 7, lines 22-28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make available a plurality of communication networks to allow access in a plurality of ways.

22. Although Ogushi et al. disclose data exchange between the supervisory device and the remote device (see column 3, lines 46-54; column 4, lines 14-21), they do not explicitly disclose that the remote operation device displays the same screen as that displayed in the supervisory device. Nevertheless, Tonozuka et al., in a similar field of endeavor, disclose the operation of a supervisory device from a remote device in which the same information is displayed on both the supervisory device and the remote device (see column 2, lines 26-37; column 4, lines 10-33). To one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, it would have been an obvious modification to the system of Ogushi et al. to present the communicated data that is common to the supervisory device and the remote device as the same screen, as is taught by Tonozuka et al., for more precisely monitoring the notification and information outputted by the supervisory device.

23. Regarding claim 12, Ogushi et al. do not explicitly disclose the use of a plurality of communication networks to connect between the host devices and the remote devices. However, Crater et al. present a plurality of communication networks, including a public telephone network, the internet, and a local area network, by which to connect the devices, and their respective communication elements (see column 6, lines 50-58; column 7, lines 22-28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make available a plurality of communication networks to allow access in a plurality of ways.

### **CONCLUSION**

24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel M. Ungar whose telephone number is 571.272.7960. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 6:00 Monday - Thursday, Alt. Fridays.

Art Unit: 2132


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571.272.3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit 2132

DMU

Daniel M. Ungar

  
GILBERTO BARRON JR.  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100